

REMARKS

Claims 1 through 14 are pending in the application. All claims stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by *Hoover*. Specifically, Examiner is not according patentable weight to the limitation that the a laminar plate is generally coextensive with the bottom surface of the mailbox because the limitation is preceded by the phrase “adapted to be:”

Response to Arguments

The applicant has argued that the *Hoover* reference does not teach a plate which is generally coextensive to a lower surface of a mailbox. This is unpersuasive because the applicant has argued the claim narrower than recited in that the claim recites that the plate is “adapted” to be generally coextensive with the mailbox, which means that the plate may only need to be “capable” of performing such a function. It is easy to see

Applicant has eliminated the “adapted” phrase from that portion of each of independent claims 1, 7, and 12, as well as dependent claim 3.

The “adapted” language was introduced at the behest of the first Examiner on the application, even though Applicant did not think it necessary. The “adapted” language remains at the points where the laminar plate supports the mailbox and where the sleeve receives the post. Where it is eliminated, it specifies only that the laminar plate is coextensive with, or has approximately the same dimensions as, the bottom of the mailbox. Therefore, no combination/subcombination problem is created: the claim is directed to a bracket that cooperates with environmental features (a post) to support a mailbox.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that the “coextensive” limitation is entitled to patentable weight and the claims are not vague and indefinite. The application has been thoroughly

searched both before and after the introduction of the "adapted" language, so Applicant submits that the amendment should be entered after final rejection. Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration and allowance of all claims.

Applicant has now made an earnest attempt to place this application in condition for allowance, or in better condition for appeal. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests, for the reasons set forth herein and for other reasons clearly apparent, allowance of all pending claims so that the application may be passed to issue.

If the Examiner has any questions or desires clarification of any sort, or deems that any further amendment is desirable to place this application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number listed below.

Applicant believes no fee is due for the filing of this amendment and response. If this is incorrect, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fee or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-2180.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark D. Perdue
Reg. No. 36,890
Storm LLP
Bank of America Plaza
901 Main Street, Suite 7100
Dallas, TX 75202
Telephone: (214) 347-4708
Fax: (214) 347-4799
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT